Staff recommends creating a separate IT capital section in the Long Bill in order to create separate headnotes that may summarize or comment on requirements for IT capital appropriation(s).

JBC Letter Request	Staff Recommendations
Bullet Six: Recommendations for common language and definitions that best identify and describe legislative oversight and budget process components relative to the agile development model	Staff recommends using common IT terms regardless of the methodology used when communicating with the legislative branch. The legislative branch, the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting, and the Governor's Office of Information Technology should continue to collaborate to develop analogous project management terms and consistent information that apply to all methodologies to ensure clear communication in the budget requests and in legislative updates.
Bullet One: The period of appropriation spending authority	Staff recommends that the period of appropriation spending authority should remain the same. For multiyear projects, IT capital appropriations should be dependent on:
	 the prior fiscal year's budget that is spent and encumbered; the prior fiscal year's planned milestones completed; and adjustments in the planned budget and schedule benchmarks to complete the project's entire scope.
	A federal funding match may require traditional planning documentation and a percentage of annual state funding to demonstrate the state support for the project.
Bullet Five: Expectations or requirements for updating and communicating changes to the JTC and JBC for anticipated annual operating and ongoing development improvement funding needs at the completion of initial development that provides for implementation of a minimally viable or acceptable project	Staff recommends that capital IT projects should remain under the JTC's purview until the project's deliverables meet the critical business requirements, including decommissioning any impacted existing technology and resources. Projects should only be annualized in the operating budget after the minimum viable product (MVP) or minimum acceptable product (MAP) provides all the critical requirements, including decommissioning any existing technology or resources that might be impacted.
Bullets Two, Three, and Four: Expectations or requirements for achieving and reporting progress within the agile development model	The adoption of an agile methodology requires a cultural change in project expectations to support the agile recurring iterations to inspect and adapt.
	Staff recommends that departments provide updates on the following so that legislators may assess the progress of a major IT project:
Standards for reporting cost metrics related to the stages of agile development with comparison to the proposed plan	 ten-year system roadmap; budget, schedule, and scope benchmarks for the entire project; and annual milestone schedule and corresponding estimated cost.
Expectations or requirements for updating and communicating changes to the JTC and JBC for multiyear projects based on advanced progress or challenges experienced within the agile development model	Changes in the project's budget, schedule, and scope benchmarks and annual estimates should be reported to the JTC through the existing procedures and budget cycle, or when the department deems it necessary or beneficial to the success of the project. The JTC might also consider the following when completing its oversight of a major IT project:
	 deliverables that meet the stated scope, including decommissioning applicable existing technology and resources; confirmations from departments that confirms project deliverable(s) meet an acceptable level of functionality and quality; and comparisons between projected operating budgets provided in initial budget requests and future annual operating budget requests.